



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,964	03/09/2000	JAKOB SKOPICKI	BE-3920	3176

466 7590 03/10/2003

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

HOLMES, MICHAEL B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/521,964

Applicant(s)

SKOPICKI, JAKOB

Examiner

Michael B. Holmes

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/521,964.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This action is responsive to application **09/521,964**, filed **March 09, 2000**.
2. **Claims 1-15** have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. Applicant is respectfully remind of the ongoing Duty to disclose 37 C.F.R. 1.56 all pertinent information and material pertaining to the patentability of applicant's claimed invention, by continuing to submitting in a timely manner PTO-1449, Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with the filing of applicant's of application or thereafter.

Drawings Objection

4. Albeit, the drawing has been reviewed by the USPTO Office of Draftperson's Patent Drawings Review. It is not particularly descriptive, nor representative of applicant's invention.

Specification Objection

5. Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.

Or alternatively, Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix": See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.

- (e) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
 - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
 - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is

Art Unit: 2121

separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.
- (i) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet (37 CFR 1.52(b)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).
- (k) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

Art Unit: 2121

6. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 8-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim (claim 4). Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 8-11, a "device for practicing the process ..."
8. On page 14, the word "CLAIMS" has to be proceeded by a verb or pronoun.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

Art Unit: 2121

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10. **Claims 1, 4, 8-11, & 12**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), Date of Patent: Mar. 30, 1999, Filed: Nov. 28, 1995.**

As per claim 1, Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), teaches a process for the automatic identification of a document in a computer, characterized in that the data contained in the document are analyzed according to their content and/or their position in the document and they are compared one by one to one or more identification criteria of documents, an identification criterion being defined by the content and/or the position of a datum characteristic of a document / **“Background and Summary of the Invention” (FIG. 1A & FIG. 1B; col. 2, line 54 to col. 3, line 12) /**

As per claim 4, Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), teaches a process for automatic classification and filing of documents emitted from a computer (**FIG. 1A & FIG. 1B**), characterized in that, during the sending of a document to be published toward a publication support, the data contained in the document are analyzed according to their content and/or their position in the document and they are compared one by one to one or more of the identification criteria of the document, an identification criterion being defined by the content and/or the position of a characteristic datum of a document, the data of the document are also compared to at least one classification criterion, each criterion corresponding to a type of document to be classified and a

Art Unit: 2121

classification in the memory of the computer in which are memorized documents having this criterion; and when the comparison is negative, there can be defined at least one new identification criterion corresponding to a type of document and at least one classification criterion corresponding to a classification in the memory of the computer in which is copied said document; / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1b, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) /** and, when the comparison is positive, said document is automatically copied into the memory of the computer according to the corresponding classification or classifications. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) /**

As per claim 8, rejected for the same reasons as claim 4, i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), a device for practicing the process characterized in that it comprises means for analyzing the data contained in a document to be published, emitted from a computer toward a publication support, means for comparing said data one by one with one or several memorized identification criteria, means for copying into the memory of the computer the document upon a positive identification and means for defining at least one identification criterion and at least one classification criterion of a document upon a negative comparison. / “E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) /

Art Unit: 2121

As per claim 9, rejected for the same reasons as claim 4. i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), a device characterized in that the means for defining an identification criterion of the document comprise means for copying into the document the datum serving as an identification criterion, said datum being copied with its positioning parameters in the document from the document. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) /**

As per claim 10, rejected for the same reasons as claim 4. i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), a device characterized in that the identification criterion and the classification criterion are defined at the time of emission of the document toward the publishing support. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) /**

As per claim 11, rejected for the same reasons as claim 4. i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), a device characterized in that all of the unidentified published documents from one or several computers are temporarily stored in a library where a user, preferably an authorized one, can cause the analysis of these documents. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) /**

Art Unit: 2121

As per claim 12, rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 & 4. i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), a computer readable medium embodying computer instructions for a process to automatically identify a document in a computer and for causing the computer to execute the steps of: analyzing data of a document by performing at least one datum analysis according to a datum content or a datum position in the document to obtain at least one datum analysis result; / **“Background and Summary of the Invention” (FIG. 1A & FIG. 1B; col. 2, line 54 to col. 3, line 12)** / obtaining a comparison result by comparing each datum analysis result to at least one document identification criteria, each identification criterion being defined by at least one of the content and the position of a datum characteristic of a document; / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42)** / and characterizing data contained in the document based on the obtained comparison result. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49); “G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1A, FIG. 1B, & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42)** /

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claims 2-3, 5-7, 13-15**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664), Date of Patent: Dec. 7, 1999, Filed: Nov. 14, 1997** in view of “**Official Notice**”.

Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,889,886), does not explicitly teach the limitations of **claims 2-3, 5-7, 13-15**, respectively. However, **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches the limitations of **claims 2-3, 5-7, 13-15**.

Regarding **claim 2**, **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches a process characterized in that, when the comparison is negative (*validation check*), a parametric window is opened to define at least one new identification criterion associated with this document, said new criterion being memorized to identify thereafter any document having this datum. / “**E. Defining Genre Models**” (FIG. 1 & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49) / “**Official Notice**” is taken, in that, the limitations of claim 2, are old and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant’s

Art Unit: 2121

invention set forth in claim 2. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant's invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Regarding **claim 3, Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches process characterized in that an identification criterion is defined by copying a datum of the text of the document serving as an identification criterion toward the parametric window where this datum is copied, associated with its position parameters in the document. / **"G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42)** / "Official Notice" is taken, in that, the limitations of claim 3, is old and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant's invention set forth in claim 3. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant's invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding **claim 5, rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.** i.e., **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches a process characterized in that, when the comparison is negative, a parametric window is opened to define at least one new identification criterion associated with this document and at least one classification criterion, said new identification criterion being memorized to identify thereafter any document having the same identification criterion and the classification criterion controlling its automatic filing in the associated classification. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1 & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49) / “Official Notice”** is taken, in that, the limitations of claim 5, is old and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant’s invention set forth in claim 5. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant’s invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Regarding **claim 6, rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.** i.e., **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches a process characterized in that an identification criterion is defined by copying a datum of the text of the document serving as an identification criterion, toward the parametric window where this datum is copied associated with its position parameters in the document. / **“G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1 & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) / “Official Notice”** is taken, the limitations of claim 6, is old

Art Unit: 2121

and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant's invention set forth in claim 6. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant's invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Regarding **claim 7, Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches a process characterized in that the data contained in the document are analyzed by analyzing and transcoding the signals emitted from the computer toward the publication support. / **"A. System Overview (FIG. 1; col. 7, line 09 to line 56) / "Official Notice"** is taken, in that, the limitations of claim 7 are old and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant's invention set forth in claim 7. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant's invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Regarding **claim 13, rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 & 5**, i.e., **Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664)**, teaches a computer readable medium wherein, when the obtained comparison result

Art Unit: 2121

is negative, the medium comprises further instructions causing the computer to open a parametric window to define at least one new identification criterion datum associated with the document, the new criterion being memorized to identify thereafter any document having the new identification criterion datum. / **“E. Defining Genre Models” (FIG. 1 & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49) / “Official Notice”** is taken, in that, the limitations of claim 13, is old and well known.

Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant’s invention set forth in claim 13. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant’s invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Regarding claim 14, rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 & 6, i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664), teaches a computer readable medium wherein, the new identification criterion datum is defined by copying a datum of a text of the document serving as a new identification criterion reference datum toward the parametric window where the reference datum is copied and associated with its document position parameters. / **“G. Summarizing a Document Image and Sets of Document Images (FIG. 1 & FIG. 3; col. 23, line 25 to line 42) / “Official Notice”** is taken, the limitations of claim 14, is old and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant’s invention set forth in claim 14. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2121

was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant's invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Regarding **claim 15, rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 & 5** i.e., Mahoney et al. (USPN 5,999,664), teaches a computer readable medium wherein, when the obtained comparison results are positive, the medium comprises further instructions causing the computer to automatically copy the document into a memory of the computer according to a corresponding classification or classifications. / **"E. Defining Genre Models" (FIG. 1 & FIG. 7; col. 21, line 18 to line 49) /** "Official Notice" is taken, in that, the limitations of claim 15, is old and well known. Moreover, examiners position is that one skill in the electronic data processing and technological art would know how to implement applicant's invention set forth in claim 15. Therefore, it would have been *obvious* at the time the invention was made to a persons having ordinary skill in the electronic data processing and technological art to which applicant's invention pertains, to automatically identify, analyze characteristics of the machine readable data i.e., image or text of a document and provide a means for validating, updating, copying, and saving, , the input data through a standard GUI interface for subsequent processing.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and (listed of form **PTO-892**) not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant or applicant's representative is respectfully reminded that in process of patent prosecution i.e., amending of claims in response to a rejection of claims set forth by the Examiner per Title 35 U.S.C. The patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and any objections made. Moreover, applicant or applicant's representative must clearly show how the amendments avoid or overcome such references and objections. *See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).*

Correspondence Information

14. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 308-6280**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding After Final issues, please send it to **(703) 746-7238**. If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to **(703) 746-7239**. If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft) facsimile transmission the fax is **(703) 746-7240**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the **Examiner's Supervisor, John Follansbee**, may be reached at **(703) 305-8498**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed too:

Art Unit: 2121

Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231. Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of **Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia.**

Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**